
Retrospective Theses and Dissertations

1986

Marital Satisfaction as a Function of Gender, Own Rationality and Spouse's Rationality

Gabrielle T. Vincent
University of Central Florida

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/rtd>
University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Masters Thesis (Open Access) is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Retrospective Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

STARS Citation

Vincent, Gabrielle T., "Marital Satisfaction as a Function of Gender, Own Rationality and Spouse's Rationality" (1986). *Retrospective Theses and Dissertations*. 4881.
<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/rtd/4881>

MARITAL SATISFACTION AS A FUNCTION OF GENDER, OWN
RATIONALITY AND SPOUSE'S RATIONALITY

BY

GABRIELLE THERESE VINCENT
B.A., University of South Florida, 1984

THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Master of Science degree in Clinical Psychology
in the Graduate Studies Program
of the College of Arts and Sciences
University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Summer Term
1986

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
METHOD	9
Subjects	9
Materials	9
Procedure	11
Data Analysis	11
RESULTS	13
DISCUSSION	21
APPENDIX A - Information and Consent Form	26
APPENDIX B - Background Information Sheet	28
APPENDIX C - Relationship Belief Inventory	29
APPENDIX D - Dyadic Adjustment Scale	32
REFERENCES	36

INTRODUCTION

Cognitions and beliefs held by individuals play a large role in how they view their environment, others and self. That an individual's perception of reality in any of these areas is dependent on the organization and content of one's belief system seems well accepted in the literature (Beck, 1976; Ellis, 1967 Epstein, 1982; Guidano & Liotti, 1983, Jacobson & Margolin, 1979).

The relation of faulty cognition to psychological dysfunction has been scrutinized by a number of leading theorists. Albert Ellis has directed much of his energy in therapy and research toward the identification and elimination of irrational beliefs and faulty cognitions. He maintains that dysfunction is originally learned and encouraged by the indoctrination of irrational beliefs from significant others during childhood. As adults, false beliefs are activated by processes of auto suggestion and self-repetition (Ellis, 1967).

Ellis (1967) asserts that "emotional disturbance, therefore, essentially consists of mistaken, illogical, unvalidatable sentences or meanings which the disturbed individual dogmatically and unchallengingly believes, and upon which he therefore emotes or acts to his own defeat" (p. 68). He has identified several core irrational ideas

that are internalized and typically lead to self-defeat. For example, Ellis (1967) suggests a relationship between depression and the following core irrational beliefs: "The idea that one should be thoroughly competent, adequate and achieving in all possible respects if one is to consider oneself worthwhile," and "The idea that it is awful and catastrophic when things are not the way one would very much like them to be" (p. 70).

These ideas are supported by Nelson (1977), who assessed the extent to which certain types of irrational beliefs co-varied with severity of depression. The relationship between irrational beliefs assessed using the Jones' Irrational Beliefs Test (IBT; Jones, 1968) and depression indicated that the two beliefs just described had the strongest statistically significant correlation with depression when compared to eight other dysfunctional beliefs.

Ellis (1975) also examined the role an individual's irrational beliefs play in generating and maintaining anxiety. He believed that while some dangerous and fearsome situations are unavoidable, an individual's reaction to them can be modified. He identified a core irrational belief that individuals typically adopt when they are anxious, that is, the belief that if something proves threatening one must get terribly occupied with and upset about it. He asserts that this can be avoided by a realistic assessment of the

probability of a dreadful consequence occurring and the realization that most overconcern stems from an individual's dogmatically held personal definitions.

In addition, to the emphasis Ellis (1967, 1975) and Nelson (1977) place on the relationship between adherence to irrational beliefs and psychological dysfunction, LaPointe and Crandell (1980) also report evidence for this relationship. They conducted a study to measure any differences in the use of irrational beliefs among normals, psychologically distressed but not depressed people and those who described themselves as depressed and distressed. The correlational findings indicated that depressed persons scored as more irrational on the IBT than other equally distressed but non-depressed persons. Depressed subjects also had the highest score indicative of "a need to excel in everything in order to feel worthwhile," and "being terribly upset when things are not as one wishes" (p. 249).

Beck (1976), in his evaluation of the roles of faulty cognition and irrational beliefs in psychopathology, asserted that one avenue of approach for relieving depression is to involve clients in critically evaluating their behavior by focusing on the irrational negative self-statements they make. He advocates teaching clients systematic skills of self-observation, so that they can see the relationship between thoughts and emotions. He further describes how negative emotional reactions (i.e.,

depression, anger, anxiety) can be a function of distortions that disregard important aspects of a situation or are a result of overly simplified and rigid thinking or are generalized from a single incident of failure.

Other cognitive theorists (Foreyt & Rathjen, 1978) have focused on how unrealistic expectations influence the generation of excessive anger and identified the following:

(1) Highly unrealistic expectations for desirable consequences that do not result can make an undesired outcome more aversive; (2) Highly unrealistic expectations that someone will behave adversely can reduce one's provocation threshold so that anger and antagonistic reactions have a higher probability of occurrence; and (3) Unrealistically low expectations for dealing positively with an aversive situation can lead to anger and aggression in an attempt to achieve control over the aversive experience. These authors also note how repeated antagonistic self-statements can inflame anger by focusing attention on aversive characteristics of persons and situations and by recalling provocative incidents. Irrational ruminations about aversive experiences can thus prolong anger beyond the point that it might otherwise have dissipated.

While cognitive and behavior therapists assert that an individual's belief system can play an important role in personal dysfunction, they also have begun to focus on the influence of cognitions and beliefs in intimate

relationships. There is an increasing attention by researchers and marital therapists toward the correlation between cognitive dysfunction and relationship dissatisfaction among couples (Eidelson & Epstein, 1982a; Epstein, 1982b; Epstein & Eidelson, 1981; Epstein, Finnegan & Bythell, 1979; Jacobson & Margolin, 1979).

According to cognitive theory, an individual's emotional and behavioral response to a stimulus (internal or external) is mediated by what the person perceives and interprets about the stimulus rather than being directly elicited by objective characteristics of the stimulus (Beck, 1976; Meichenbaum, 1977). The couple is an interpersonal system where members of the relationship continuously provide stimuli for one another and interpret the behaviors exchanged. It is well established in the literature that the marital dyad is a complex system where satisfaction and dissatisfaction are states produced by a great variety of behaviors. Jacobson and Margolin (1979) and Weiss (1978) describe marital satisfaction as a subjective state dependent on the exchange of idiosyncratically defined pleasing and displeasing behaviors between spouses. On the basis of the assumptions noted above, it is suggested that the understanding and change that can occur in therapy necessitates attention to cognitive events in the marital relationship.

Margolin and Weiss (1978) assert that an awareness of cognitive states benefits the marital therapist. Therapy will have little impact on a distressed couple unless faulty perceptions and unrealistic expectations are exposed and worked on in therapy. Simply put, dysfunctional cognitions adversely affect relationship quality (Eidelson & Epstein, 1982).

Unrealistic beliefs held by couples can result in a number of consequences detrimental to the relationship. In a recent study, (Epstein & Eidelson, 1981) clients' unrealistic beliefs about their relationships as measured by the Irrational Beliefs Test (Jones, 1968) and the Relationship Belief Inventory (Epstein & Eidelson, 1981) were negatively associated with a couple's: (1) chance of improvement in therapy; (2) desire to improve rather than terminate the relationship; (3) preference for marital versus individually oriented treatment; and (4) overall marital satisfaction.

This study reexamined the general relationship between unrealistic beliefs and faulty cognitions and level of marital satisfaction in a nonclinical population. It was anticipated that individual's who adhere to unrealistic beliefs would demonstrate lower levels of relationship satisfaction than those who indicated a more limited adherence to unrealistic beliefs. This study attempted to preserve the dyad by exclusive use of subjects married to

each other. This allowed a determination of the separate effects of one's own rationality and the rationality of one's spouse on one's marital satisfaction. It was also possible to determine whether own and spouse's rationality have similar effects in males and females. Past research on the effects of irrational beliefs on relationship satisfaction have typically focused only on one's own rationality (Eidelson & Epstein, 1982; Epstein & Eidelson, 1981; Epstein, Finnegan & Bythell, 1979). This study includes multiple variables, such as, gender, own rationality, spouse's rationality and any interactions between combinations of these variables as factors with possible significance for marital satisfaction.

For all subjects, own and spouse's score on the Relationship Belief Inventory was correlated with marital satisfaction as measured by their score on the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS; Spanier, 1976). Significant negative correlations are expected for these two correlations. Gender, for all subjects, was correlated with DAS score and a zero correlation was predicted. In addition, correlations between own and spouse's RBI score and own DAS score were conducted separately for males and females.

A multiple regression analysis with DAS scores as the dependent variable and subject's gender, own RBI score and spouse's RBI score as the predictor variables was conducted.

One's own RBI score was predicted to be the most powerful variable in determining DAS score.

T-tests were conducted to compare RBI subscale scores and total RBI scores for males and females. No predictions were offered to describe any differential strengths of beliefs as a function of sex.

Finally, a 2x2x2 analysis of variance with own RBI, spouse's RBI and gender as the independent variable was used to assess any significant main effects of these variables.

METHOD

Subjects

Subjects consisted of faculty members and their spouses from Rollins College in Winter Park, University of Central Florida in Orlando, couples at Miami Heights Elementary School in Miami and couples employed by Lake Sumter Community Mental Health in Leesburg. Forty-four couples agreed to participate in this study. Subjects ranged in age from 24 to 64.

Materials

An information and consent form describing the general purpose of the study and informing subjects of their rights as participants was utilized in accordance with the ethical standards of APA (see Appendix A). The consent form also provided instructions for distribution and collection of the questionnaires.

A brief information sheet included in the packet requested subjects to indicate their gender and if a copy of the completed study was requested for their inspection (see Appendix B). It also reminded subjects not to collaborate in their efforts to complete the questionnaires and reassured them of their anonymity.

Two self-report questionnaires were used--The Relationship Belief Inventory (RBI; Epstein & Eidelson,

1981) and the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS; Spanier, 1976). The RBI consists of eight items on each of five sub-scales representing dysfunctional beliefs, where each item can be rated from 0 to 5 (see Appendix C). The highest sub-scale score possible, indicative of more unrealistic beliefs, is 40. The RBI sub-scales are labelled: Disagreement is Destructive (D), Mindreading is Expected (M), Partners Cannot Change (C), Sexual Perfectionism (S) and The Sexes are Different (MF). The reliabilities for these scales as measured by Cronbach's coefficient alpha are .81, .75, .76, .72, and .72, respectively (Eidelson & Epstein, 1982).

Marital adjustment was measured by the DAS (see Appendix D). The DAS can be used for unmarried cohabiting couples as well as for married couples. It contains 32 items rated on 4-, 5- or 6-point continuums on which low scores represent dissatisfaction and high scores represent satisfaction. A score below 100 is used by marital therapists as an indicator of marital dissatisfaction.

There are four scales on the DAS--dyadic satisfaction, dyadic cohesion, dyadic consensus and affectional expression. The reliabilities for these scales as measured by Cronbach's coefficient alpha are .94, .86, .90 and .73, respectively (Spanier, 1976). Items on these scales discriminate between couples more satisfied and happy with their relationships from those dissatisfied and distressed over their relationship.

Procedure

One member of each couple was approached in person by the experimenter or her research assistant to inquire if they would be willing to participate. For those who agreed, the two packets of questionnaires were given to the contacted spouse to distribute to themselves and to their partner at home. The scales for each spouse were in separate unsealed blank envelopes that were numbered to designate dyads.

The contacted spouse was told that complete instructions were in each packet and that participation of the spouse not contacted was strictly voluntary. The packets were collected at the subject's employment site at the time the subject designated as most convenient to him or her. Any questions regarding the study were answered at this time. The packets were held by couples for one to two weeks. Five couples accepted packets and then refused to complete them.

Data Analysis

The variable DAS score was correlated with RBI scores using a Pearson product moment correlation. For all subjects, own and spouse's RBI scores were correlated with total DAS score. Significant negative correlations were expected for these two correlations. Gender, for all subjects, was also correlated with DAS score and a zero

correlation was predicted. In addition, correlational analyses between own RBI score and DAS score was conducted separately for males and females. Correlational analyses were also conducted separately for males and females between spouse's RBI score and DAS score.

A multiple regression analysis, the primary analysis, with DAS scores as the dependent variable and subject's gender, own RBI score and spouse's RBI score as the predictor variables was conducted. The standard beta coefficients were used to indicate the relative weight of each of these variables in determining the DAS score. One's own RBI score was predicted to be the most powerful variable in determining the DAS score.

T-tests were also used to compare RBI subscale scores and total RBI scores for males and females. No predictions were offered to describe any differences in total rationality or in patterns of adherence to any of the subscales of the RBI.

Finally, a 2x2x2 analysis of variance was conducted to assess any significant main effects of the following grouping variables: (1) own beliefs; (2) spouse's beliefs; and (3) gender, on DAS scores. A 2x2x2 ANOVA identified any interactions between combinations of these variables.

RESULTS

The variable describing present state of marital satisfaction is the Dyadic Adjustment Scale total score (DASTOT). DASTOT was derived by adding the numerical values of the responses to the 32 items which are rated on 4-, 5- or 6-point continuums. DASTOT means for males and females were $\bar{M} = 111.91$ and $\bar{M} = 113.50$, respectively. Standard deviations for DASTOT were as follows: $\underline{SD} = 13.33$ for males and $\underline{SD} = 12.29$ for females.

The Relationship Belief Inventory total score was computed by adding the numerical values assigned to eight items on each of five subscales and then adding the five subscales together. The two variables that describe both the husband's and wife's current level of rationality (not necessarily in that order) are a subject's own total score (OWNRBI) and their spouse's total score (SPSRBI). OWNRBI means and standard deviations were again computed separately for males and females. For males, the OWNRBI mean was $\bar{M} = 58.91$ while the standard deviation was $\underline{SD} = 21.46$. For females, the OWNRBI mean was $\bar{M} = 59.98$ while the standard deviation was $\underline{SD} = 16.16$.

A Pearson r correlation was used to assess the magnitude of the relationships between DASTOT and each of the following variables: OWNRBI, SPSRBI and gender. The

correlations for all subjects are shown in Table 1. Significant negative correlations were observed between OWN RBI and DASTOT and SPSRBI and DASTOT. A significant positive correlation was observed between OWN RBI and SPSRBI.

Pearson correlations were also computed on these variables after dividing the data according to gender. This division was necessary to determine whether the pattern of relationships differed for males and females. These results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 shows that all correlations between RBI scores and DASTOT scores are negative, but the correlations with DASTOT are significantly different from zero only for husband's OWN RBI and wife's SPSRBI. Thus it is the husband's RBI score which is related to satisfaction for both husbands and wives. Given the differences in the relative magnitudes of the correlations between OWN RBI and SPSRBI and DASTOT, the differences between the corresponding correlations for males and females in Table 2 were tested for significance, using Fisher's z statistic (Guilford & Fruchter, 1973). Neither the difference between the male and female correlations between OWN RBI and DASTOT ($z = 1.353$) nor the difference between male and female correlations between SPSRBI and DASTOT ($z = .239$) approached statistical significance.

TABLE 1
CORRELATION BETWEEN DASTOT, OWNRBI, SPSRBI AND GENDER
FOR ALL SUBJECTS

	GENDER	OWNRBI	SPSRBI	DASTOT
GENDER	--	-.0284	.0284	-.0619
OWNRBI		--	.2283*	-.3477**
SPSRBI			--	-.2527**
DASTOT				--

df=36 for all correlations

1-tailed significance

*=.05

**=.01

TABLE 2
CORRELATION BETWEEN OWNRBI, SPSRBI AND DASTOT FOR MALES
AND FEMALES

Variable		OWNRBI	SPSRBI	DASTOT
OWNRBI	<u>M</u>	--	.2386	-.4623*
	<u>F</u>	--	.2386	-.1930
SPSRBI	<u>M</u>		--	-.2266
	<u>F</u>		--	-.2794*
DASTOT	<u>M</u>			--
	<u>F</u>			--

M=Males

F=Females

df=36 for all correlations

*p .05, one tailed

A multiple regression analysis was performed to determine the relative contributions of the predictor variables (OWNRBI and SPSRBI), to variance in the criterion variable, DASTOT. Data for subjects was split by gender of subjects and then the two predictor variables, OWRNBI and SPSRBI, were entered into the regression equation in steps, with the variable with the highest zero order correlation being entered first. For males, OWRNBI significantly predicted DASTOT scores ($\underline{R}^2 = -.214$, $\underline{p} = .001$), but the addition of SPSRBI to the regression equation produced only a negligible change in the multiple correlation (change in $\underline{R}^2 = 0.014$, $\underline{p} = .388$). Thus only OWRNBI scores significantly predicted DASTOT scores for males.

For females, the opposite pattern emerged. SPSRBI score significantly predicted DASTOT scores ($\underline{R}^2 = -.279$, $\underline{p} = .033$, one tailed), but addition of OWRNBI to the equation produced only a negligible increase in \underline{R}^2 (change in $\underline{R}^2 = .017$, $\underline{p} = .386$).

A similar but not identical pattern emerges from calculation of partial correlations. For males, the partial correlation between OWRNBI and DASTOT with SPSRBI controlled for is significant ($\underline{r} = -.432$, $\underline{t}(41) = -3.059$, $\underline{p} < .01$), but the correlation between SPSRBI and DASTOT, with variance due to OWRNBI partialled out is not ($\underline{r} = -.135$, $\underline{t}(41) = -.873$, n.s.).

For females, neither the partial correlation between OWN RBI and DASTOT and SPSRBI controlled for ($r = -.135$, $t(41) = -.873$, n.s.) nor the correlation between SPSRBI and DASTOT with variance due to OWN RBI partialled out ($r = -.245$, $t(41) = -1.622$, $p < .10$, one tailed) was significant. The latter closely approaches significance, but falls short because SPSRBI shares some variance in common with OWN RBI.

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to assess any possible interactions between OWN RBI, SPSRBI and gender as they effect DASTOT. A median split was conducted for OWN RBI and SPSRBI and gender was scored as a dichotomous variable to which the number one was arbitrarily assigned to designate females and the number two for males. These three variables were entered into a 2x2x2 ANOVA and the results demonstrated that none of the main effects or interaction effects were significant. The means for DASTOT by gender, OWN RBI and SPSRBI for males were $\bar{M}_s = 111.91$; 109.75 and 109.85, respectively. Those same means for females were $\bar{M}_s = 113.50$; 116.25 and 116.12, respectively. Thus, on the basis of the findings described in the previously mentioned analyses, the relationship between OWN RBI, SPSRBI and gender to DASTOT appears to be most accurately described as an additive one.

Finally, multiple t-tests were used to compare RBI subscale means and DASTOT means for males and females. The results are presented in Table 3. None of these comparisons approached statistical significance. Thus, males and females did not differ in total rationality nor in their particular adherence to any of the subscales of the RBI. It may be noted that a casual comparison demonstrated that RBI subscale scores for the present study were lower than scores for both the clinical and nonclinical sample used in Eidelson and Epstein's (1982) study.

TABLE 3
MEANS FOR MALES AND FEMALES BY RBI SUBSCALES AND
RBI TOTAL SCORE

	Females	Males
D	10.82	10.05
M	12.91	12.48
C	11.25	10.30
SP	13.11	12.77
MFD	11.89	13.43
OWNRBI	59.98	58.91

D = Disagreement is Destructive; M = Mindreading is Expected; C = Partners Cannot Change; SP = Sexual Perfectionism; MFD = The Sexes Are Different.

$p < .05$

DISCUSSION

As expected, the results clearly confirmed the hypothesis that RBI scores are negatively correlated with DAS scores for all subjects. These results were consistent with earlier research examining the negative association between cognitive dysfunction (high RBI scores) and relationship dissatisfaction (low DAS scores) among couples (Eidelson & Epstein, 1982; Epstein, 1982; Epstein & Eidelson, 1981; Epstein, Finnegan & Bythell, 1979; Jacobson & Margolin, 1979). This study also demonstrated that both OWN RBI and SPSRBI had an impact on one's DASTOT. This primary inspection of the data implied that marital satisfaction depended on the behaviors exchanged and cognitions of both spouses (Jacobson & Margolin, 1979). Further examination of the results, however, revealed that it was the husband's "rationality," in particular, which was strongly related to both his own satisfaction and his wife's satisfaction with the relationship. A comparison of the significant negative correlations for males, between OWN RBI and DASTOT, ($r = -.4623$, $p < .05$), and females, for the association between SPSRBI and DASTOT, ($r = -.2794$, $p < .05$) illustrates this finding.

Epstein and Eidelson (1981) reported that one's own rationality was more important than spouse's rationality. On the basis of this finding, they posited the notion that marital therapists cannot assume that treatment directed toward one spouse's cognitions would directly affect the other's cognitions. To a certain extent, this was confirmed by the present study. In addition, however, this study found that OWN RBI was most influential only for males. It is possible that Eidelson and Epstein (1981) could have had similar results had they divided the data according to gender as this study did.

One possible statistically based explanation for the higher correlation for males was that the standard deviation was higher for males indicating a greater variability in RBI scores than was exhibited for females. The difference between male and female variability closely approached statistical significance ($F = 1.76$, $p > .05$, n.s.). Means for males and females were virtually identical.

Another possible explanation is that males may have more power in the relationship which would make them more likely to control what happens. Thus, the rationality of the husband would have a greater affect on their interactions than his spouse's rationality. For example, a husband who believes that a disagreement is destructive could cause the couple to avoid discussion of many important

topics, thus lowering both his own and his wife's satisfaction.

Further exploration of the data revealed that while the husband's rationality was more influential than the wife's on marital satisfaction, there was still the question of whose satisfaction was affected the most. The general theoretical conclusion reached was that it was also true that the husband's rationality predicted his own satisfaction better than it predicted his wife's satisfaction. In other words, the husband's RBI score does affect his wife's DASTOT score, but indirectly and more weakly than it affected his own DASTOT. It was interesting to note that while the husband's RBI score predicted his wife's DASTOT score with less accuracy than it predicted his own DASTOT score, it was still a better predictor than her own RBI score.

A comparison of the means for the five RBI subscales and the total RBI score for males and females revealed no significant differences. Eidelson and Epstein (1981) partially confirmed this finding in an examination of correlations between belief scale scores and criterion measures conducted separately for males and females which found no significant differences for the following beliefs: Disagreement is Destructive; Mindreading is Expected; and Partner's Cannot Change. The two RBI subscales, Sexual Perfectionism and The Sexes Are Different, were not included

in that study as they did not exist in 1981. A significant difference in the variance for the Sexes Are Different was demonstrated in this study as well as a near significant difference in variance for Sexual Perfectionism. Again, males demonstrated greater variability than females.

It is important to note that the greater variability for males was only observed on the newer scales. Perhaps this variability may be attributed to the fact that of the five sub-scales, the lowest intercorrelation exists between Sexual Perfectionism and The Sexes Are Different (Eidelson & Epstein, 1982). Another possible explanation is that items on these scales represent issues more important for males.

Ability to generalize the results of this study may be increased due to the fact that a nonclinical sample was used. Additional research in this area is needed to clarify the impact of husband's vs. wife's rationality on relationship satisfaction. In particular, future research might well focus on the role of sex role attitudes and behaviors as moderators of the relationship between rationality and satisfaction. The view adopted here would suggest that husband's and wife's rationality would make equal contributions to their satisfaction in truly egalitarian relationships.

These results provide pertinent information for how to target treatment in couples therapy most effectively. The

present study implied that a therapist should monitor the husband's rationality more closely when attempting to modify cognitions as they affect relationship satisfaction. For example, whether the husband is more irrational or rational than his wife, his cooperation or resistance in therapy is most relevant to any gains or setbacks experienced. Perhaps an evaluation of the sex roles assumed by partners in the relationship is relevant to how powerfully a spouse's rationality influences marital satisfaction.

APPENDIX A

INFORMATION AND CONSENT FORM

The purpose of this form is to provide you with information about a research project which we are conducting and to request that you participate in it as a subject. This research is concerned with the relationship between certain beliefs which persons have about their relationships and their feelings about their marital relationships. The research is being conducted by Gabrielle Therese Vincent as a part of her master's thesis, and is being supervised by Dr. Randy Fisher, of the Department of Psychology at the University of Central Florida.

To participate in this research you must be married and currently living with your spouse. Participation will entail filling out two anonymous questionnaires (and a brief information sheet asking your gender and whether you desire feedback from the study) and should take you no longer than 30-40 minutes. In addition, if you are the person first approached by Ms. Vincent, you will be asked to deliver this information and consent form and the questionnaires to your spouse. Your spouse should be allowed to read this form and decide for himself/herself whether he/she wishes to participate. If your spouse has any questions regarding his/her participation, they may call either Ms. Vincent (646-2130) or Dr. Fisher (275-2558). If both of you decide to participate, then you should complete your questionnaires alone. You should both seal them in their respective envelopes for return to Ms. Vincent.

All information obtained in this study will remain completely confidential. Your responses and those of your spouse will be coded so that we can link couples together, however, your names will not be linked to your responses. Even after signing this consent form, you may withdraw from the study and have your questionnaire destroyed if you change your mind about participating. Please do not discuss your responses with your spouse before completing the questionnaires. Whether you discuss them with your spouse after completion is left up to you.

The risks of participating in this study seem to us to be minimal since all responses will remain anonymous. It is possible that participation may be beneficial, to the extent that it fosters reflection on and communication about

various aspects of your marital relationship. Knowledge of the results of the study may also be useful to you. Accordingly, a copy of the completed report will be made available to your faculty department. A copy of the completed thesis will also be available in the UCF library under Ms. Vincent's name.

My signature below indicates that I have read the above information, and that being fully aware of it, I freely agree to participate in this research.

Signature:

Date:

APPENDIX B

BACKGROUND INFORMATION SHEET

Please respond to the items on the two questionnaires honestly. Your participation requires completion of the questionnaires in private. Spouses must not collaborate in any way in their efforts to fill out the questionnaires.

Upon completion, place the questionnaires in the envelope they were delivered in and seal it immediately. The spouse contacted by the experimenter is asked to collect his or her questionnaires and the questionnaires of their spouse and return both of the sealed envelopes to the respective faculty department. Please deliver completed questionnaires to the designated department secretary or collection box placed near department mailboxes.

A copy of the complete study will be on file for subjects to review at the UCF library under the name of Gabrielle Therese Vincent.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Please indicate:

_____ male _____ female

_____ I request an extra copy of the completed study to be available at the department in addition to the copy available to me at the UCF library.

APPENDIX C

RELATIONSHIP BELIEF INVENTORY

The statements below describe ways in which a person might feel about a relationship with another person. Please mark the space next to each statement according to how strongly you believe that it is true or false for you. Please mark every one. Write in 5, 4, 3, 2, 1, or 0 to stand for the following answers.

- 5: I strongly believe that the statement is true.
 - 4: I believe that the statement is true.
 - 3: I believe that the statement is probably true, or more true than false.
 - 2: I believe that the statement is probably false, or more false than true.
 - 1: I believe that the statement is false.
 - 0: I strongly believe that the statement is false.
-

- 1. If your partner expresses disagreement with your ideas, he/she probably does not think highly of you.
- 2. I do not expect my partner to sense all my moods.
- 3. Damages done early in a relationship probably cannot be reversed.
- 4. I get upset if I think I have not completely satisfied my partner sexually.
- 5. Men and women have the same basic emotional needs.
- 6. I cannot accept it when my partner disagrees with me.
- 7. If I have to tell my partner that something is important to me, it does not mean he/she is insensitive to me.
- 8. My partner does not seem capable of behaving other than he/she does now.

- ___ 9. If I'm not in the mood for sex when my partner is, I don't get upset about it.
- ___ 10. Misunderstandings between partners generally are due to inborn differences in psychological makeups of men and women.
- ___ 11. I take it as a personal insult when my partner disagrees with an important idea of mine.
- ___ 12. I get very upset if my partner does not recognize how I am feeling and I have to tell him/her.
- ___ 13. A partner can learn to become more responsive to his/her partner's needs.
- ___ 14. A good sexual partner can get himself/herself aroused for sex whenever necessary.
- ___ 15. Men and women probably will never understand the opposite sex very well.
- ___ 16. I like it when my partner presents views different from mine.
- ___ 17. People who have a close relationship can sense each other's needs as if they could read each other's minds.
- ___ 18. Just because my partner has acted in ways that upset me does not mean he/she will do so in the future.
- ___ 19. If I cannot perform well sexually whenever my partner is in the mood, I would consider that I have a problem.
- ___ 20. Men and women need the same basic things out of a relationship.
- ___ 21. I get very upset when my partner and I cannot see things the same way.
- ___ 22. It is important to me for my partner to anticipate my needs by sensing changes in my moods.
- ___ 23. A partner who hurts you badly once probably will hurt you again.
- ___ 24. I can feel OK about my lovemaking even if my partner does not achieve orgasm.

- ___ 25. Biological differences between men and women are not major causes of couple's problems.
- ___ 26. I cannot tolerate it when my partner argues with me.
- ___ 27. A partner should know what you are thinking or feeling without you having to tell.
- ___ 28. If my partner wants to change, I believe that he/she can do it.
- ___ 29. If my sexual partner does not get satisfied completely, it does not mean I have failed.
- ___ 30. One of the major causes of marital problems is that men and women have different emotional needs.
- ___ 31. When my partner and I disagree, I feel like our relationship is falling apart.
- ___ 32. People who love each other know exactly what each other's thoughts are without a word ever being said.
- ___ 33. If you don't like the way a relationship is going, you can make it better.
- ___ 34. Some difficulties in my sexual performance do not mean personal failure to me.
- ___ 35. You can't really understand someone of the opposite sex.
- ___ 36. I do not doubt my partner's feelings for me when we argue.
- ___ 37. If you have to ask your partner for something, it shows that he/she was not "tuned into" your needs.
- ___ 38. I do not expect my partner to be able to change.
- ___ 39. When I do not seem to be performing well sexually, I get upset.
- ___ 40. Men and women will always be mysteries to each other.

APPENDIX D

DYADIC ADJUSTMENT SCALE

Most persons have disagreements in their relationships. Please indicate below the approximate extent of agreement or disagreement between you and your partner for each item on the following list.

	<u>Always Agree</u>	<u>Almost Always Agree</u>	<u>Occa- sionally Disagree</u>	<u>Fre- quently Disagree</u>	<u>Always Disagree</u>	<u>Always Disagree</u>
1. Handling family finances	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
2. Matters of recreation	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
3. Religious matters	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
4. Demonstrations of affections	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
5. Friends	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
6. Sex relations	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
7. Conventionality (correct or proper behavior)	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
8. Philosophy of life	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
9. Ways of dealing with parents or in-laws	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>

	<u>Always Agree</u>	<u>Almost Always Agree</u>	<u>Occa- sionally Disagree</u>	<u>Fre- quently Disagree</u>	<u>Always Disagree</u>	<u>Always Disagree</u>
10. Aims, goals, and things believed important	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
11. Amount of time spent together	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
12. Making major decisions	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
13. Household tasks	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
14. Leisure time interests and activities	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
15. Career decisions	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
	<u>All the Time</u>	<u>Most of the Time</u>	<u>More often than not</u>	<u>Occa- sionally</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Never</u>
16. How often do you discuss or have you considered divorce, separation, or terminating your relationship?	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
17. How often do you or your mate leave the house after a fight?	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>

	<u>All the Time</u>	<u>Most of the Time</u>	<u>More often than not</u>	<u>Occa- sionally</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Never</u>
18. In general, how often do you think that things between you and your partner are going well?	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
	<u>All the Time</u>	<u>Most of the Time</u>	<u>More often than not</u>	<u>Occa- sionally</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Never</u>
19. Do you confide in your mate?	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
20. Do you ever regret that you married (or lived together)?	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
21. How often do you and your partner quarrel?	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
22. How often do you and your mate "get on each other's nerves?"	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>

	<u>Every Day</u>	<u>Almost Every Day</u>	<u>Occa- sionally</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Never</u>
23. Do you kiss your mate?	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
	<u>All of them</u>	<u>Most of them</u>	<u>Some of them</u>	<u>Very few of them</u>	<u>None of them</u>
24. Do you and your mate engage in outside interests together?	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>

How often would you say the following events occur between you and your mate?

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Less than once a month</u>	<u>Once or twice a month</u>	<u>Once or twice a week</u>	<u>Once a day</u>	<u>More often</u>
25. Have a stimulating exchange of ideas	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
26. Laugh together	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
27. Calmly discuss something	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Less than once a month</u>	<u>Once or twice a month</u>	<u>Once or twice a week</u>	<u>Once a day</u>	<u>More often</u>
28. Work together on a project	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>

These are some things about which couples agree and sometimes disagree. Indicate if either item below caused differences of opinions or were problems in your relationship during the past few weeks. (Check yes or no)

Yes No

29. Being too tired for sex.

30. Not showing love.

31. The following line represents different degrees of happiness in your relationship. The middle point, "happy," represents the degree of happiness of most relationships. Please circle the number which best describes the degree of happiness, all things considered, of your relationship.

<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
Extremely Unhappy	Fairly Unhappy	A Little Unhappy	Happy	Very Happy	Extremely Happy	Perfect

32. Which of the following statements best describes how you feel about the future of your relationship?

- ☐ I want desperately for my relationship to succeed, and would go to almost any length to see that it does.
- ☐ I want very much for my relationship to succeed, and will do all I can to see that it does.
- ☐ I want very much for my relationship to succeed, and will do my fair share to see that it does.
- ☐ It would be nice if my relationship succeeded, but I can't do much more than I am doing now to help it succeed.
- ☐ It would be nice if it succeeded, but I refuse to do any more than I am doing now to keep the relationship going.
- ☐ My relationship can never succeed, and there is no more that I can do to keep the relationship going.

REFERENCES

- Beck, A. T. (1976). Cognitive therapy and emotional disorders. New York: International Universities Press.
- Corey, G. (1982). Theory and practice of counseling and psychotherapy. Monterey: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Eidelson, R. J., & Epstein, N. (1982). Cognition and relationship maladjustment: Development of a measure of dysfunctional relationship beliefs. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 50, 715-720.
- Ellis, A. (1969). Rational-emotive psychotherapy. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ellis, A. (1975). A new guide to rational living. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Epstein, N., & Eidelson, R. J. (1981). Unrealistic beliefs of clinical couples: Their relationship to expectations, goals and satisfaction. The American Journal of Family Therapy, 9, 13-21.
- Foreyt, J. P., & Rathjen, D. P. (1978). Cognitive behavior therapy. New York: Plenum Press.
- Guidano, V. F., & Liotti, G. (1983). Cognitive processes and emotional disorders. New York: Plenum Press.
- Guildord, J. P., & Fruchter, B. (1973). Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- LaPointe, K. A., & Crandell, C. J. (1980). Relationship of irrational beliefs to self-reported depression. Cognitive Therapy and Research, 4, 247-250.
- Margolin, G., & Weiss, R. (1978). Comparative evaluation of therapeutic components associated with behavioral marital treatment. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46, 1476-1486.
- Meichenbaum, D. (1977). Cognitive behavior modification: An integrative approach. New York: Plenum Press.

Nelson, R. E. (1977). Irrational beliefs in depression.
Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45,
1190-1191.

Spanier, G. B. (1976). Measuring dyadic adjustment: New
scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar
dyads. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 38, 15-28.